

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 2 have been canceled.

Claim 3 has been amended to be an independent claim, incorporating the structure for general formula I from canceled claim 1 and to require that R has four (4) carbon atoms. Support for the amendment can be found in the Specification on page 6, lines 8-12.

Claim 8 has been amended to correct the claim dependency.

Claim 11 has been amended to correct a typographical error.

No new matter has been added.

Objections to the Claims

The Examiner has objected to claim 11 because the term “cyclic” is misspelled as “cycloic.”

Applicants have amended claim 11 to correct the misspelling, thereby obviating the objection.

Rejections Under 35 USC § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 8 and 13 as obvious over Hayashi and Narasaka. The Examiner states that Hayashi and Narasaka teach a compound of formula (I) where R is Me. The Examiner also states that Hayashi and Narasaka teach that the Epolactaene compound “is effective to the neurite outgrowth of a human neuroblastoma cell line.”

The Examiner contends that adjacent homologues and structural isomers are generally so similar that substitution of a variable with such constituents would be obvious. She contends that

the motivation to make and use the claimed compounds derives from the expectation that structurally similar compounds are generally expected to have similar properties and have similar utilities. Thus, according to the Examiner, the skilled artisan would have been motivated to use such homologues with the expectation that the resulting products would all have similar activity. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Applicants have amended the claims to require R in general formula I to be a linear, branched or cyclic alkyl group having 4 carbon atoms. The effect of inhibiting growth of neuroblastoma by the compound as now defined is presented in the Example on page 39 of the Specification. In addition, the Declaration of Dr. Kakeya submitted with the Response filed on April 24, 2007 presented surprisingly improved results in side-by-side comparisons of the composition disclosed in Hayashi and Narasaka, namely Epolactaene, which contains a Me group in the R position and the invention as now claimed. Specifically, the claimed invention provides an excellent neuroblastoma growth-inhibitory activity compared to Epolactaene. Here, the compound of the invention had a 50% growth-inhibiting concentration of 0.4 $\mu\text{g/ml}$ as compared to Epolactaene's 2.0 $\mu\text{g/ml}$. That is, the compound of the invention had 5 times more efficacy than did Epolactaene. This is important because administering a lower drug dosage to a patient to obtain the same effect drastically reduces any potential side-effects.

Lastly, Applicants note that Hayahi and Narasaka do not disclose or suggest that the Epolactaene analogs would show an excellent neuroblastoma growth-inhibitory effect at all. Consequently, in view of the above, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and removal of the rejection.


All of the claims remaining in the case, including those newly entered claims, are submitted to be novel, nonobvious, patentable subject matter and Applicants urge favorable action and early allowance of the claims.

If the Examiner has any questions concerning this application, the Examiner is strongly urged to contact Susan Gorman (Reg. No: 47,604) at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. § 1.16 or under § 1.17, particularly extension of time fees.

Dated: July 10, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By  #47,604
Mark J. Nuell, Ph.D.
Registration No. 36,623
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Rd
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(858) 792-8855
Attorneys for Applicant